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1. Purpose of Heritage Building Guidelines

“A university’s excellence is and always will be measured, first and foremost, by the quality of its programs, students and faculty. Its built environment – from buildings and other structures to the space that surrounds and contains them – must be their equal. The quality of Texas A&M University’s facilities must reflect the quality of the people and programs they house.”

Dr. Robert M. Gates, President writing in his introductory letter to the Campus Master Plan, 2004

The 2004 Campus Master Plan and the Campus Remembered project (2001-2004) identified the historic buildings and spaces on the central core of the campus whose qualities and forms reflect the values and traditions of the university.

The clear set of guidelines for the design of new buildings to be introduced into the fabric of the campus is based on the architectural principles used in the design of these heritage buildings. They are proving a useful tool for the Design Review Board and the campus community to ensure that new buildings build upon and enhance the traditions of the campus.

The Historic Core District Plan, completed by the Campus Master Plan team in December 2007, covers the majority of these areas and buildings and makes specific reference to the significance of the landscape, hardscape, and planting treatments in terms of evaluation and future treatment.

However, the guidelines for the design of new buildings do not address a process for evaluating heritage buildings, nor do they include any guidance for their analysis, treatment, alteration, modification, additions or maintenance.

Additionally, as buildings grow older their value as part of the campus heritage becomes clearer, and their importance as representatives of later building periods receives greater appreciation. Consideration must therefore be given to developing a continuous review for the treatment of all existing buildings.

Buildings that already exist on the campus are susceptible to wholesale or incremental changes, unwise repair, and poor maintenance that can jeopardize their significance and integrity, the very qualities that were deemed important as guidance for the design of future buildings.

These guidelines provide a methodology for the evaluation, analysis and treatment of the existing historic buildings on the campus. They establish a specific approach to the built heritage of the campus that will guide future work to existing buildings, including the restoration of historic features and the management of necessary change and rehabilitation to meet current codes and regulations, and to meet future needs.
The guidelines establish clear “triggers” that must result in the evaluation of existing buildings prior to undertaking work that might change their intrinsic value.

Heritage Conservation procedures preserve the best of the past for the benefit of the future, and allow for the wise management of needed changes.

2. Procedures for Work to Existing Campus Buildings

The full evaluation of a historic building is referred to as a Historic Structures Report (HSR), and is described in National Park Service Preservation Brief #43. However, such reports are only justified for buildings of the highest significance, or where the proposed project involves extensive work to the building. The major components of data needed to make informed judgments on the appropriate way to treat an existing building can often be gathered without a full HSR.

It should be noted that Texas A&M University already has expertise available for building evaluation, specifically qualified persons in the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Planning and Construction, the Office of the Vice President for Facilities, and in the Center for Heritage Conservation.

Consideration should be given to ensuring that such expertise be identified and recognized as proposals for work to existing buildings are reviewed.

The mandate of the Design Review Board includes oversight of projects where the work is likely to impact the physical appearance of significant aspects of the exterior and/or interior of the building.

Step 1 - Conditions Analysis and Evaluation Report

A Conditions Analysis and Evaluation Report for Heritage Buildings will provide data to sustain the historic significance of a resource. Before the analysis process begins, Texas A&M University will have completed the Facility Conditions Assessment (FCA) for all buildings on the Texas A&M University campus. A database of these findings will be created and the information gathered in the Condition Analysis and Evaluation Report for buildings of historic and cultural significance will be added to the database.

While this extended analysis should be done for each building identified within the Historic Core District (all buildings highlighted on page 18 of the 2007 Historic Core District Plan) budget constraints will normally restrict the development of an HSR to funded projects when one of the trigger actions noted in Section #3 occurs. Buildings outside of this district that have been identified by the Campus Remembered Project should also be included in this comprehensive assessment as funds allow.
The HSR will be prepared by an Architect selected by the TAMUS Facilities Planning & Construction, or by the TAMU Physical Plant in accordance with TAMUS Policy Par. 51.02. The Architect selected for this project will be eligible for consideration to provide A/E services for the subject project.

There are 48 structures within the Historic Core District outlined on page 18 of the Historic Core District Plan. Of these 48 structures, 14 are designated in The Campus Remembered listing. It is recommended that after completion of the initial Conditions Analysis and Evaluation Report for buildings within the Historic Core and on the Campus Remembered list, this additional assessment should eventually be carried out for all existing buildings on Campus, and should be implemented for any existing building whenever major work or re-assignment is proposed.

Content of Analysis and Evaluation Report for Heritage Buildings

Database Information in Facility Condition Assessment
This work is in progress for all Campus Buildings with an expected completion date of Spring 2009.

• Building Number
• Building Name
• Date of Construction
• Known Alterations and Dates
• Gross Sq. Footage
• Original / Current Use
• Existing Conditions Photograph

Architectural Feature Documentation
This will be completed by Historic Preservation Architect with thorough knowledge of the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation, and historic building maintenance procedures when a trigger action noted in Section 3 occurs.

Every historic building is unique in its identity and character. These qualities are distinguished by the structure’s visual aspects and physical features.

By identifying these building features and taking them into account during any work on the structure it will ensure the retention and careful maintenance of as much historic fabric as possible.

When evaluating a building’s Exterior and Interior architectural features, National Park Service Preservation Briefs 17 and 18 should be referenced to ensure that a complete and thorough identification has be done before any work begins.

After identification, each feature will receive a Historic Rating in order to define its condition (refer to step 2).
**Step 2 – Historic Rating**
This will be developed by the Historic Preservation Architect when a trigger action noted in Section 3 occurs.

A conditions survey should be undertaken for each of the 51 buildings located within the Historic Core and on the Campus Remembered listing. Each building will be given a Historic Rating of: “Undetermined,” “Historic,” “Treat as Historic,” or “Not Historic.”

After proper evaluation, each identified feature should be assigned, within the Conditions Assessment, the most appropriate rating out of the following: H - Historic; T - Treat as Historic; N - Not Historic; U - Undetermined

**Criteria for Historic Rating**
- **Historic**
  Must meet at least one of the following:
  - Possess central importance in defining or maintaining the historic, architectural, natural or cultural character of Texas A&M University
  - Possess outstanding architectural, engineering, artistic or landscape characteristics unique to the Nation, state or institution
  - Have considerable potential for continued or adaptive reuse.
  - Is otherwise highly valued by Texas A&M University

- **Treat as Historic**
  - The feature is not original. However, it is an appropriate replacement and should be treated as if it has historic significance.
  - Must meet at least one of the above criteria for “Historic” rating.

- **Not Historic**
  - The feature meets none of the criteria for a “Historic” or “Treat as Historic” rating.

- **Undetermined**
  - The criteria to establish the “Historic” rating cannot be determined

**Step 3 – Designation of Compatible Uses**
The designation will be determined by the Council for the Built Environment with advice from Preservation Architect.
The unique characteristics and physical constraints of historic architecture should be considered when identifying potential new uses for historic buildings. The acceptable new use for historic buildings should fall into one of seven categories:

- Office/Administrative
- Office/Classroom
- Office/Laboratory/Studio
- Residential-Undergraduate
- Residential-Graduate/Faculty
- Recreation
- Assembly

A combination of any of these options may be chosen.

**Step 4 - Establishment of a Scope of Work**

**Routine Maintenance**
Reference should be made to the NPS Preservation Briefs dealing with maintenance, and the development of manuals for general use, with specific references to individual buildings as needed.

The training of all maintenance and custodial staff must include specific components on historic fabric and the value of heritage resources.

Building proctors should also be made aware of these aspects of the buildings for which they are responsible.

1. Assessing Cleaning and Water - Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings
2. Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings
6. Dangers of Abrasive Cleaning to Historic Buildings
7. Preservation of Historic Glazed Architectural Terra Cotta
21. Repairing Historic Flat Plaster - Walls and Ceilings
28. Painting Historic Interiors
40. Preserving Historic Ceramic Tile Floors

**Step 5 - Agreement on Physical Changes**

Suggested by Historic Preservation Architect, approved by CBE & DRB, approved by System FP&C or University Physical Plant)

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings identify four basic treatments for historic buildings.

1. Preservation
   - The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property.
2 Rehabilitation
The act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

3 Restoration
The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

4 Reconstruction
The act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

In order to retain as much historic fabric as possible, and to meet the unique needs of each building, most projects employ a combination of these four treatments.

The interior and the exterior of the building will be evaluated separately, using the criteria for each method listed below. The most acceptable treatment will then be assigned to each separate category.

### Preservation Treatment Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extensive Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Moderate Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Minor Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Corrective Maintenance</th>
<th>Complete Demolition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Features</td>
<td>Preservation, Restoration and/or Reconstruction</td>
<td>Preservation, Restoration and/or Reconstruction</td>
<td>Preservation and/or Restoration</td>
<td>Preservation and/or Restoration</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP/FP Systems</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade</td>
<td>Typical Repairs</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility &amp; Drainage Systems</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade</td>
<td>Typical Repairs</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Projected to be Major</td>
<td>Minor/Selective</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Grade Alteration</td>
<td>Grade Alteration</td>
<td>Grade Alteration</td>
<td>Grade Alteration</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demolition
While Demolition is a ‘treatment’ that results in the complete removal of historic fabric, the recommendation to demolish a building may arise during the process of evaluation and analysis when a resource can no longer meet the needs of university, or when it is determined that the cost of other treatments cannot be justified by the outcomes. (Note the requirement in the Antiquities Code of Texas, Chapter 191.)

When Demolition is the agreed treatment, the building should be documented and significant artifacts retained for future use.

Additions to Existing Buildings
The philosophy of designing additions to existing buildings is one of the most sensitive and important issues in the field of heritage conservation, and has critical importance where the existing building has been identified as of historic significance.

Again, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards suggest that, in most cases, the new intervention not be a copy of the original, but that it should be designed as a recognizable addition that is compatible with the original and adds to the quality of the whole.

The complex issues involved in making significant additions to historic buildings require that the design team include individuals with demonstrated experience and ability in the field.

3. Actions to Trigger Building Analysis and Evaluation

The trigger goes into effect when the project is funded and the analysis must be completed prior to work being commenced.

Council on the Built Environment
- Proposes re-assignment of a building, or a significant portion of a building
- Proposes addition to a building identified as having historic or cultural significance

Office of the Vice President for Facilities
- Proposes repairs to the exterior of a building identified as having historic or cultural significance
- Plans to undertake interior changes to a building identified as having historic or cultural significance
- Receives Work Request for work to a building identified as having historic or cultural significance
4. Recommendations by the Design Review Board (DRB)

Recommendations by the DRB will be based on a review of the findings from the evaluation process described in section 2.

The recommendation will be based on an assessment of the appropriateness of the proposed actions, and specifically on the impact the proposed work will have on the integrity of the historic resource, the context in which the resource sits, and the long-term significance of the outcome.

It is therefore important that the contents of the material submitted to the DRB follow the steps outlined in section 2, and include statements from qualified professionals.

The report should be prepared after the completion of the procedure set forth by the Guidelines.

The contents should include:

i. Summary of the history of the building

ii. An explanation of the overall findings of the Condition Analysis and Evaluation Report (CAER)

iii. Comments on the proposed use for the building (if changing)

iv. Comments on the proposed treatments (exterior and interior)

v. Recommendations for further study

A letter of transmittal should serve as an Executive Summary of the key issues raised by the proposed work.
Sec. 191.098. Notification of Alteration or Demolition of Possible Landmark.

(a) A state agency may not alter, renovate, or demolish a building possessed by the state that was constructed at least 50 years before the alteration, renovation, or demolition and that has not been designated a landmark by the committee, without notifying the committee of the proposed alteration, renovation, or demolition not later than the 60th day before the day on which the agency begins the alteration, renovation, or demolition.

(b) After receipt of the notice the committee may waive the waiting period; however, if the committee institutes proceedings to determine whether the building is a state archeological landmark under Section 191.092 of this code not later than the 60th day after the day on which the notice is received by the committee, the agency must obtain a permit from the committee before beginning an alteration, renovation, or demolition of the building during the time that the committee’s proceedings are pending.

(c) Should the committee fail to provide a substantive response within 60 days to a request for a review of project plans, application for permit, draft report review, or other business required under the Antiquities Code, the applicant may proceed without further reference to the committee.

6  APPENDIX A: Summary of the Campus Historic Context

The present state of the campus has been influenced by five distinct development phases. Existing buildings on campus are being categorized by development phase in order to help determine their significance.

1876 - 1908
The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas opened in October 1876 for the study of agriculture, mechanical arts, and the natural sciences. The first building of the campus, the Old Main (the Stewards Hall), was accompanied by the President’s Home (later Gathright Hall) along with five minor structures. In the first thirty years, more than ten significant buildings were constructed, most of them designed by Larmour or Eugene T. Heiner of Houston. The structures of this period are characterized by picturesque massing, either Victorian or Second Empire in style. For example, Old Main was a typical Second Empire structure constructed of red brick and limestone with a mansard roof. The Assembly Hall, Ross Hall, Goodwin Hall are other examples of this architectural style.

1909 - 1919
The major part of the historic core of the campus at present was developed with the commission of F. E. Giesecke as the campus architect in 1908. During this phase, classicism became the prominent architectural style which was projected on many of the significant buildings were constructed such as the Academic Building (1912), Nagle Hall (1909), Bolton Hall (1912), Bizzell Hall (1914), the YMCA Building (1914), Leggett Hall (1911), Sbisa Mess Hall (1912), Guion Hall (1918), and Francis Hall (1918). In 1915, the “Permanent Campus Plan” was generated which operated as an infrastructure for the campus development for two decades. The development of quads around the Academic Building, the construction of the street system and the construction of Military Walk were undertaken according to this plan.

1920 - 1941
This phase is distinctive with the manifestation of the classically proportioned structures such as the Physics Building (1920, renamed Psychology in 1987), Agriculture Building and, Extension Service Building (1924, renamed as Military Science in 1933) and the formal establishment of the Simpson Drill Field in 1920. Further, this phase is identified with the architect, Samuel C.P. Vosper, the chief designer at the College of Architecture and the architect F.E. Giesecke. The construction of the Chemistry Building (1924) is the signature of this new direction of the campus architecture. Vosper’s elaborate work which embodies the spirit of the space in animal figure reliefs, polychrome tiles, stone mosaics and intricate ironwork is projected in diversified construction projects initiated in 1932. The Agricultural Building (later renamed as Scoates Hall), Animal Industries Building, Petroleum Engineering (later renamed Halbouty Geosciences Building), Veterinary Hospital (later renamed as Civil
Engineering), and the Administration Building (now the Williams Administration Building) are all examples of this proliferation of architectural details.

1942 - 1962
Unlike the prolific and rich quality and the character of the first 70 years of the campus growth, the postwar period is marked by the rapid growth of the campus and the insufficient resources allocated to the buildings. The buildings of this phase, not only would no longer relate to the older ones architecturally but also the vocabulary of architecture became more isolated even those buildings built in the same time frame. One of the contributing reasons for the significant loss of the overall continuity for the continuity of the architectural language is although the office of College Architect remained; most of the buildings were executed by outside firms. The Memorial Student Center (1950), the Richard Coke Building (1951), the G. Rollie White Coliseum (1952), the Printing Center (1955), the Herman Heep Building (1957), Biology Sciences Building East (1950), Henderson Hall (1958), the Doherty Building (1960), and All Faiths Chapel (1958) are diversified buildings from this period.

1963 - 2003
During this period the position of College Architect was discontinued and a variety of administrative structures were introduced. The Office of Planning and Institutional Analysis was founded in 1967 in order to create a master plan and provide support services on a continuing basis. In 1972, the office along with Caudill, Rowlett & Scott published a report “Texas A & M University Campus Planning Workbook”. This study was continued with the 1974 Landscape Master Plan by Myrick, Newman & Dahlberg. This period is marked by the decentralization of the campus community, particularly the development of buildings west of the Wellborn Road. Unlike the buildings from the previous periods, the structures at this phase were program driven and individual, with little sense of the nature of ‘campus’ or the creation of spaces between buildings that would maintain the human scale of the historic campus. The siting of the buildings was mostly driven by surface parking. The tremendous parking growth and the raise of the student population (in 2003, more than 45,000 students and 33,000 parking spaces.) Even though, in the 1981 West Campus Master Plan, Schrickel, Rollins, and Associates supported the development of the area of campus west of Wellborn Road, in the subsequent 1990 Master Plan, the drawbacks of this approach were investigated such as the distance from East Campus, linkage across Wellborn Road and the railroad, and the lack of a symbolic axial connection to the east campus. Changes in the civic structure of the core during this period included the Albritton Bell Tower (1984), New Main Drive improvements (2002) and the Koldus Building (1991), the latter integrating a parking garage with an office structure, a technique that enhances the appearance of the campus, but which required simultaneous funding from two distinct sources.
**Post-2004**

The major achievement of 2004 was the development of the Campus Master Plan, and its adoption by the Texas A&M University System Board of Regents. Subsequent actions established a Council on the Built Environment (CBE) to advise the President of the University on all matters relating to the creation of new buildings, and the assignment of existing spaces. Also, a Design Review Board (DRB) was appointed to advise the President of the University on the compliance of new construction with the Campus Master Plan. Each of these two bodies interfaced with existing operational offices at both System and University levels. The Campus Master Plan team developed a more detailed study of the Historic Core of the campus. The Design Review Board also generated a more specific tool to evaluate Landscape aspects of the Campus Master Plan, and this proposal to establish procedures to evaluate and protect the integrity of existing historic buildings.

In fall 2008, following a review of the initial two-year operations of the DRB, the university administration established the position of University Architect, and two-year appointment of a faculty member, each to serve as co-chairs of the Design Review Board. The DRB membership was revised, and two members were appointed as full members of the Council on the Built Environment. The charge to the DRB continues to be the guardianship of the intent of the Campus Master Plan.
### APPENDIX B: Preliminary List of Historic Buildings on the Texas A&M University Campus

#### Buildings Within Historic Core District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Known alterations &amp; dates</th>
<th>gross sq footage</th>
<th>original &amp; current uses</th>
<th>TAMU recognized?</th>
<th>NSA Register Eligible?</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Building</td>
<td>ACAD</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Programs, H E</td>
<td>AGHE</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Industries Building</td>
<td>ANIN</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology Building</td>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Faiths Chapel</td>
<td>CHFS</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Center Building I</td>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Center Building II</td>
<td>ARCS</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar Health Center</td>
<td>BEXH</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences High East</td>
<td>BSEVE</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences High West</td>
<td>BSEW</td>
<td>469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazos Hall</td>
<td>BLSH</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivar Hall</td>
<td>BOLV</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragg Hall</td>
<td>BRAG</td>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Hall</td>
<td>BTBR</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry Building</td>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry Building Addition</td>
<td>CHAY</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Building</td>
<td>COLE</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Sciences Addition</td>
<td>CSAY</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Sciences Center</td>
<td>CSCE</td>
<td>516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Library</td>
<td>COUN</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklund Geology Building</td>
<td>GBUILD</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Library</td>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follett Hall</td>
<td>FOLE</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology Greenhouse</td>
<td>GEQH</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Genetics Greenhouse</td>
<td>FGQH</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hall</td>
<td>FRAN</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Center - Classroom Ring</td>
<td>HARR</td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington Center - Office Tower</td>
<td>HART</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart Residence Hall</td>
<td>HART</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healey Hall</td>
<td>HEAL</td>
<td>481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healey Laboratory Building</td>
<td>HLAB</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners Club</td>
<td>LAND</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendelton Hall</td>
<td>HEND</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Building</td>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture Greenhouse</td>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longford Architecture Building</td>
<td>LARCH</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leggett Residence Hall</td>
<td>LEGG</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Hall</td>
<td>LIGHT</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton Hall</td>
<td>PAXH</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Building</td>
<td>PATT</td>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Building</td>
<td>PSYH</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Hall</td>
<td>STUD</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Chemical Building</td>
<td>STCHE</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiger Computing Center</td>
<td>STEG</td>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Research Center</td>
<td>TXRc</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Hall</td>
<td>THOM</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Administration Building</td>
<td>WADM</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMU Building</td>
<td>TMBU</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Historic Buildings Outside Historic Core District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Known alterations &amp; dates</th>
<th>gross sq footage</th>
<th>original &amp; current uses</th>
<th>TAMU recognized?</th>
<th>NSA Register Eligible?</th>
<th>Historic Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering Building</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls County Courthouse Building</td>
<td>FALL</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Dining Hall</td>
<td>SIBN</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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